



U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made. *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)); *accord* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Here, however, because no objection has been made, this Court “must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Id.* (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P 72 advisory committee note). Moreover, in the absence of specific objections to the R & R, the Court need not give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s analysis and recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199-200 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the pleadings, the parties’ briefing, and the R & R, and concludes that the Magistrate Judge correctly applied the relevant law to the operative facts in this matter. The Court agrees that (1) Plaintiff has failed to allege that these three defendants acted under state law and, therefore, has failed to state a claim under Section 1983; (2) Plaintiff has failed to allege that any of these three defendants are motivated by a specific class-based invidiously discriminatory animus and, therefore, has failed to state a claim under Section 1985, and (3) the criminal statutes cited by Plaintiff in his Second Amended Complaint do not allow for civil causes of action.

Therefore, the Court ADOPTS the R&R, (Dkt. No. 106), as an Order of this Court. Accordingly, Defendants Corney, Strickland, and Dietrich are DISMISSED from this action.

//

//

//

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

Richard Mark Gergel  
United States District Judge

August 19, 2015  
Charleston, South Carolina